

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter L	Concern about sidewalk/tree conflicts with installation of additional sidewalks in project area; how will this be addressed?	1 - Complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Network
Commenter O	Probably beyond the scope of this plan, but better pedestrian access is needed to the park from all sides. At the southwest corner parking lot, pedestrians have worn a footpath from the street through the trees to enter the park since there are no convenient entry points there. On the north side, the park is cut off from the neighborhood to the north because this stretch of Wade has no pedestrian crossings. <i>(page 69)</i> This will be a great improvement. In the long-term, it would be great to get rid of the bridge & freeway style ramps completely and have at-grade crossings, freeing up space for other uses. <i>(page 86)</i> \$70 per lf seems high, but I guess this is including overhead and design costs? <i>(page 118)</i>	1 - Complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Network
Commenter G	First of all, I'm very impressed by the plan overall. It's very thorough and clear and it seems comprehensive to me. One minor correction - on maps (for example, p. 73) the Berkshire Cameron Village is referred to as the Berkshire Crescent. It's no longer the Crescent as that was the brand of the previous property management company (Greystar). A more substantial concern I have is that upgrading Pogue Street (trees, lighting, landscaping, etc.), which I think is a significant priority, is listed under "Neighborhood Initiated Projects" on p. 113 rather on a "by request" basis rather than under the "Clark, Everett, Kilgore pedestrian/bicycle corridor" section on a short term time frame. Having spent a lot of time in the neighborhood, Pogue Street gets more foot traffic than Clark at most times of the day because of NC State students who park in the neighborhood and RLT patrons coming and going to Hillsborough Street. While Clark gets considerably more vehicular traffic, it's not frequently used by pedestrians because there aren't destinations within the neighborhood. Jeff had some interns do analysis of foot traffic at Pogue and Clark a while back, and may be able to provide more detail. Is it too late to reconsider whether Pogue Street might be given a higher priority? Or, if it remains a "by request" project, how would one go about requesting this to move forward?	1 - Complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Networks, 4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic
Commenter CC	Identifying the Daniels/Sutton and Woodburn/Sutton as in need of pedestrian improvements is great, but as I said we can't have crosswalks without sidewalks on both sides. We sorely need a way to safely cross the street. Small Area Plans come and go, and are all about pedestrian networks, but my neighborhood remains an island with no means to cross the streets that surround it without jaywalking. - I am glad that the group was open to the idea of a small roundabout at Oberlin/Van Dyke, as it would provide a valuable opportunity for University Park residents to make a left on Oberlin (and vice-versa). It would also be pedestrian friendly, as crosswalks would be incorporated into the medians leading up to the circle. - Lastly, after my aside with Eric, I'd like to go on record with my recommendation against the proposed realignment and traffic light that would force a left turn from Peace to Clark. It's clear from looking at the traffic counts (and the comments made previously about the importance of Clark as an alternate to Hillsborough) that traffic should flow from Peace to Clark without a signalized left turn. It seems that few people coming from Peace are ultimately heading to Wade and further North on Oberlin. St Mary's offers that opportunity without having to go through the shopping center. And Smallwood as currently configured allows for easy access to that side of the shopping center (Rite Aid, Harris Teeter, etc). The intent of this design is valid (distribute traffic), but it is trying to fix something that is not broken, and its cost would be better used elsewhere (like pedestrian improvements...;)	1 - Complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Networks, 4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic
Commenter P	The Raleigh Little Theatre and Rose Garden should use their access from Clark Ave for more visibility and general access rather than burdening the surrounding neighborhoods, where parking becomes impossible when a large event is held. If the intent is to draw more people to the Raleigh Little Theatre then parking infrastructure needs to be upgraded by buying/bulldozing all the houses along Clark Avenue adjacent to the park for more parking lot space. <i>(page 73)</i> There should be a pedestrian/bicycle bridge over the railroad tracks in this vicinity to keep NCSU (especially Wolf Village) on-campus residents on foot/bike when traveling to class / Hillsborough Street rather than have them driving everywhere as is now the primary case. Generally, more connections acrosss the railroad tracks are needed especially since the city allowed NCSU to close Dan Allen to through traffic. <i>(page 73)</i> There is no need -- nor room for -- wider sidewalks or bike lanes on Gardner street without buying out all the houses on the 500 and 600 blocks of Gardner and bulldozing them. It's non-sensical why a connector to JayCee Park is here given there is no bicycle access to JayCee Park. There is already plenty of foot traffic on Gardner Street serving the neighborhood. NCSU students have an 1,100+ acre campus to use and these (Gardner Street Park aka Cannon Park) are old NEIGHBORHOOD parks not destination parks for NCSU students, who have a plethora of private facilities on campus to use. Why is this projected to cost so much (\$2.75 million)??? <i>(page 73)</i>	1 - Complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Network, 5 - Plan for Adequate and Accessible Parking

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter KK	(1) I think it’s unfortunate that this wasn’t presented to the Advisory Committee before it was put up for public comment. The failure to bring it to the committee first could undermine support. It took months to get this done, so it’s hard to believe the process could not afford a few more weeks for that to be done. (2) I would appreciate it if we set aside some time, and made sure we had the expertise available, to discuss the Clark-Peace-Smallwood realignment. I am particularly interested in whether we have run any scenarios comparing the existing configuration and the new configuration in a future condition where Cameron Village is built to the much higher CX intensity contemplated for the future. If I read the report correctly, the alternatives were only run under current traffic loads, which seems irrelevant. We have not opposed this proposal so far, but I remain unconvinced that driving us all into the heart of a massive shopping mall is a great traffic management strategy. I am also interested in the absence of an order-of-magnitude cost estimate for this proposal (and many others) in the report. (3) I would like someone to discuss the consequences of installing a neighborhood bikeway on the streets in question, particularly in Cameron Park. I am interested in what sort of hardware and striping would be installed, where the bikes would travel on the streets in question, and whether installation of the bikeways would result in the deletion of any on-street parking or alteration of any traffic pattern that currently exists.	1 - Complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Network, 6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter PP	Thanks very much for agreeing to accept comments from our neighborhood on the proposed SAP. As residents on Clark Avenue since 2007 we have seen many improvements near our home, and we look forward to seeing the area continue to evolve. We believe that neighborhood input is critical to smart development that balances the desires of developers with the interests of the diverse residents that make this such a vibrant and special place. The current emphasis on purpose-built housing for students may be profitable, but there are risks when we copy the same model over and over. When we put hundreds of students into a monoculture building the moderating effect of our mixed neighborhood is removed, and the developer can find themselves painted into a corner with difficulty placing interesting retail tenants in these buildings. The result is very little business engagement from the (very interested) families and homeowners within easy walking distance, and increasingly student-centric blocks instead of shared spaces. There is also a serious contradiction in adding dense office space and housing to a transit corridor that has no functional mass transit at this time. We all look forward to workable commuter train service to downtown Raleigh, RTP, Durham, and Chapel Hill; sadly it seems to forever be ten years away. We know that traffic continues to build with growth in the triangle area, yet hope that careful planning will somehow protect our neighborhood streets from hordes of speeding cars. Make no mistake though, we know that development will continue and we are not opposed to development, or developers. We are pleased to live in a walkable area and understand that density is an important part of further improvements. I would like to repeat some statements from a 2014 email to the city council during the Meredith Heights (Z-35-2013) review process: We love students. After all, our neighborhood is called ‘University Park’! I previously worked on Centennial Campus for WebAssign and we are proud of the proximity to NCSU. We had a house-full of NCSU graduate students living next door to us for the past two years and they were great neighbors. We like the energy and possibilities that come with all those bright people learning and developing. But the key here is that we are a mixed neighborhood -- the students know that they are living beside families and professionals and that tempers their behavior; we know that we’re living next to students and we know we should forgive occasional foolishness. We want improvements. This end of Hillsborough Street is a bit challenging with a mix of industrial (Duke Power and AlSCO), garages, older convenience stores and fast food -- and needs walkable development. In discussions with other neighbors we all agree we would like to have more interesting food choices, maybe a bakery, shops, etc. -- and we would support them. NX development with shops that serve the neighborhood, plus mixed residences targeted at young professionals seems ideal for everyone. We value the UDO effort and the NX-3 planning. As a neighbors involved who attended multiple city meetings to listen and speak about the Meredith Heights project, I was taken aback by the willingness of city planners to override the 3-story NX plan at the behest of the developer. Instead they voted unanimously to approve their request for NX-5 re-zoning for the property, along with granting transit zone exceptions that minimized the site parking requirements. We consistently had good neighbor attendance at the various steps in the process and repeatedly raised objections that were acknowledged, and then ignored in favor of the developer request. While the project was eventually abandoned, it was costly and time-consuming for neighbors. We support the UDO and 2030 Comprehensive Plan. We lived in-town in both Atlanta (Virginia-Highlands) and <i>(con't on next page)</i>	1 - Complete Pedestrian Bicycle Networks, 6 - Zone for the Future

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter PP	<p>Charlotte (Myers Park) before moving to University Park in 2007, and we chose this neighborhood because of the location and walking access to restaurants and stores. We often walk to Ridge Road for shopping (.5 miles), or to Cameron Village (1.2 miles), and we also support independent businesses on Hillsborough Street such as Wild Cook’s Indian Grill, Mur-Man Shoes, Gonza Tacos, Cup-A-Joe Coffee, Jasmine Bistro, Raleigh Brewing, and Nice Price Books. We love denser development and the idea of the transit corridor. Wade CAC vote on Meredith Heights was a landslide 99-3 in opposition (prior to the planning approval). 469 Homeowners signed the statement of opposition against Z-35-2013. The developer and their counsel played the existing zoning and various pending zoning plans off one another to request a building that was wildly out-sized compared to the surroundings. We recognize the value of healthy development in our area, but we have to ask who represents the citizens? The letter from the UPHA covers the main issues we have with the current SAP plan - we would like to add our complete support for their careful analysis, and strongly request that their changes be implemented: 1. State clearly in the SAP report that the current UDO zoning districts remain the underlying base zoning throughout the SAP study area. "To be clear, we do not support City initiated up-zoning of areas the report contemplates for increased height or zoning entitlement." 2. Indicate in the report that the rezoning process is the only legally binding tool currently available to citizens to achieve site specific project design that addresses particular context and area concerns of the surrounding community. "The rezoning process is integral to achieving high quality new development that adds benefit to the surrounding community in exchange for additional entitlement above the current zoning." 3. The SAP needs to be consistent in applying a 3-story height maximum where commercial and mixed-use areas abut all low and moderate density residential properties and neighborhoods. "Please apply the 3-story maximum height transitions to all residential areas in the study area including but not limited to: the north side of Hillsborough Street, the west side of Oberlin Rd and the south side of Clark Ave." 4. The SAP report for Hillsborough Street states a desire to “preserve and add to diversity in all its forms.” The draft report needs to offer strategies to build diverse housing types to avoid a monoculture community of student housing along Hillsborough St. 5. Retain R-6 zoning for Vanderbilt Ave to prevent both physical and visual encroachment from Hillsborough Street redevelopment. We support further public study of this area. 6. Please add the West Raleigh National Register Historic District Nomination to the list of “Relevant Studies” found in the report. 7. Based on prior survey of our University Park neighborhood residents, pedestrian improvements leading to a more walkable neighborhood are a very high priority. There are so many wonderful things about our neighborhood, and the Small Area Plan contains many exciting ideas. We look forward to seeing the next steps in this process. Thanks very much for your attention and efforts on our behalf.</p>	1 - Complete Pedestrian Bicycle Networks, 6 - Zone for the Future
University Park Homeowners Association	<i>See attached document.</i>	1 - Complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Network, 6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter JJ	<p>I've met you a few times at the Hillsborough CAC meetings. At the last meeting you talked briefly about the City's efforts to create an east-west bike route using West Johnson Street. After the meeting I asked for your business card. Here's my solution to introducing legal 2-way east-west bike traffic to West Johnson Street in Cameron Park, while also keeping parking on both sides of the street. West Johnson is converted back to 2-way vehicle traffic between St. Mary's Street and E. Forest Drive. West Johnson remains 1-way for vehicles traveling west between E. Forest and West Peace Street. (No vehicles entering W. Johnson from W. Peace, like it is now.) The city adds a marked bike lane going east along the street edge of Edna Metz Wells Park. This allows bikes to legally enter W. Johnson from the west. Now the City of Raleigh gets its official east-west bike route; with bikes traveling legally in both directions on West Johnson, and street parking stays on both sides. Also, keep in mind that W. Johnson and Park are the same width. We have parking on both side of Park Drive and 2-way traffic. West Johnson can to the same, except along Edna Metz Wells Park where we'll have 1-way vehicle traffic and 2-way bike traffic. P.S. I believe someone else has mentioned this as possible solution at a meeting as well.</p>	1 - Complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Netowrks, 4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic, 5 - Plan for Adequate and Accessible Parking

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter B	<p>Overall, this is a sensible, well-balanced plan and I thank the city for the opportunity to have served on the Advisory Board. I’d also like to thank the city staff, particularly Bynum Walter, for their fairness and patience. UPHA, our community organization, will provide a formal response on behalf of the neighborhood as a whole, but I’d like to highlight a couple of points:</p> <p>The report appears to invite reconsideration of zoning for Vanderbilt Avenue. I do not recall any particular support for this proposal during extensive discussions at the Advisory Board. Residents opposed it. It was mostly supported by the tiny “Yimby” group, which advocates greater height and density in the area than its residential zoning would permit. Vanderbilt is a residential street and those who own homes are entitled to the protection of the zoning in place when they bought those homes.</p> <p>The problems turning onto and off of Oberlin Road into and out of University Park at Bedford and Van Dyke streets was, likewise discussed at length. Traffic tie-ups and accidents increase with the volume of vehicles flowing along Oberlin. The possibility of a small roundabout with truck apron was discussed and I thought we’d agreed it was a good idea. I don’t care personally whether the solution is a roundabout or a traffic light, but the present situation must be addressed as part of the plan. Oberlin Road is currently almost impassable to foot traffic between Smallwood and Mayview, and walkability is a key element in the vision for future of the area.</p> <p>Again, thank you all for your engagement in this project, and for the respect with which you received what must sometimes have been rather tedious and repetitious community input. This is how grassroots democracy is supposed to work!</p>	1 - Complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Networks, 4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic, 6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter H	<p>The plan to increase building height on the north side of Hillsborough between Dixie Trail and Faircloth is inappropriate for this area. Most of the building north of this is single family housing. Five story buildings would dwarf these, especially in areas where the slope of land drops as one heads north from Hillsborough. With these conditions, these building would appear to be 6 or 7 stories to neighboring residents. In winter months, they would completely block the sun. Safety is another issue due to the increase in traffic. Traffic cutting through neighborhoods to avoid main streets is already a problem in Raleigh. These neighborhoods have many families where children ride bikes,skate, etc. on the streets. Children walk to local schools such as Fred Olds. (I'm sure you have read http://www.newsobserver.com/opinion/op-ed/article70816722.html)</p>	1 - Complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Networks, 6 - Zone for the Future, 7 - Promote Quality Design

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter QQ	<p>Thank you for taking comments on the Hillsborough St. Cameron Village Small Area Plan. I have the following comments which I hope will be helpful to improve the draft plan: 1 Any consideration for additional entitlement rezoning needs to be privately initiated. Neighborhood residents need negotiating ability to ensure particular concerns are met to enhance a neighborhood in exchange for additional entitlement rezoning. This is only achieved with private rezoning. The report is inconsistent and not clear where zoning is presented. Please revise and clarify. Nowhere in the report is there an explanation of the differences of city initiated and private rezoning or the consequences to stakeholders. I think this is an important omission to correct. 2. Maintain 3-story maximum where commercial and mixed-use development transitions to low and moderate density residential parcels in all neighborhoods. Adequate and consistent height transitions need to be consistently applied to all abutting neighborhoods. 3. I think the report needs to address the impact to the business economy of building primarily or exclusively apartment units specifically designed for student markets in the Hillsborough St. area. As well, 3 and 4 bedroom suites designed for students are not a healthy model for neighboring residents and strain quality of life. What are strategies to avoid building a monoculture of housing and services primarily for students along Hillsborough St.? At least a discussion of this would be appropriate to include in the report. I think we need a diversity of housing and businesses for Hillsborough St. to succeed economically for users and nearby neighborhood residents. 4. I agree with business interests that a parking strategy for Hillsborough St. is a top priority. I support a variety of public parking strategies that allow convenient turn-over of spaces to serve businesses while accommodating parking concerns of neighborhood residents. 5. Vanderbilt needs to remain R-6 (and always be indicated on the maps as R-6) until further study of additional uses is warranted and completed. Many support expanded business uses in the historic homes there and, I want to maintain the character and architecture to preserve this part of the West Raleigh Historic District and to protect the quality of life for those who live there. A mix of homeownership, rentals, and business uses is welcomed with conditions. I do not support any private spot rezoning of the Vanderbilt area and I think the report needs to be clear about that. 6. When surveyed, University Park residents are eager to have a safer walking environment. Pedestrian amenities such as sidewalks and pedestrian crosswalks are needed throughout University Park. Residents particularly need pedestrian activated crosswalks and other means of safe crossing of Oberlin Rd. to walk to Cameron Village area. Currently, this situation (crossing Oberlin as a pedestrian) is a horrible and dangerous experience. This is a top priority to improve. 7. I think the final report review process was very difficult and biased against people who do not have access to a powerful computer and internet service. Scrolling through Open Comment was frustrating and time consuming. I had to open the 144 page pdf report, make notes then construct an email to you, a very cumbersome process and my review is not as thorough as it could have been. I am in favor of using a tool like Open Comment but planners need to find a user friendly application for everyone. 8. I also found a bias in the last survey about the public’s desire to upzone or not, certain parcels in the study area. Very few realize the consequences of city-initiated upzoning and the question was not framed with an explanation which I consider a glaring omission! Stakeholders were not adequately informed to give an meaningful answer. In closing, I do not favor ANY city-initiated rezoning possibilities discussed or shown in the plan. Any potential growth areas indicated in the plan need to be accomplished through privately initiated rezoning only. I think the report should be revised to include this discussion. Thanks for entering my concerns into the public record for the SAP!</p>	1 - Complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Networks, 5 - Plan for Adequate and Accessible Parking, 6 - Zone for the Future
Wade CAC	<p>Support for 3 story height limit for Furches/Montgomery properties (<i>most of 36 meeting attendees</i>); Concerns expressed about increased height proposed for Annapolis Drive area (<i>11 of 36 meeting attendees</i>); Support for Van Dyke and Oberlin roundabout (<i>17 meeting attendees</i>). Attendees also raised concerns about adequate neighborhood transitions, restricted left turns onto Oberlin, and the impact of development on stormwater runoff.</p>	1 - Complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Networks, 4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic, 6 - Zone for the Future, 7 - Promote Quality Design

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter L	<p>I would like to comment on the Cameron Village & Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan (SAP).</p> <p>There is much to like about the SAP draft most notably improving pedestrian and cycling networks, parks, transit options, the Enterprise Street link between Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street, the emerging district on the south side of Hillsborough St west of Gorman Street. I am very supportive of these initiatives. However I cannot support SAP draft without the report addressing four key issues: 1. The SAP should apply the current UDO zoning designations to all mixed use and commercial properties adjacent to residential properties thus insuring consistent protections and height transition standards for these neighborhood homes. The SAP states that “A clear goal is to protect single family neighborhoods. Transition policies, enforced by zoning, are in effect in neighborhood-adjacent areas of potential redevelopment”. However within the SAP draft, there is inconsistent treatment for building height transitioning between mixed use districts and adjacent residential properties. This inconsistency is most evident on the north side of Hillsborough Street and on the west side of Oberlin Road where mixed use properties are adjacent to residential properties but indicate an up-zoning exceeding their current 3 story height limit. There are many new and exciting redevelopment opportunities in the study area without violating the clear goal of protecting single family homes from physical and visual encroachment of adjacent mixed use and commercial re-development. Please apply the existing UDO zoning heights and transition standards between mixed use sites and residential homes consistently to all areas along the north side of Hillsborough Street from Faircloth Street to St. Mary’s Street and along the west side of Oberlin Road. 2. The SAP report must clarify that it does not recommend City initiated rezoning. The SAP draft uses confusing language to discuss zoning. In some places the zoning discussion is called “guidance” or “recommendations”, in other places the report says “Modify zoning in the study area to achieve desired plan outcomes.” From the outset of the SAP process, the public was not notified that zoning and building intensities presented in the SAP report were for the purpose of possible City initiated upzoning. Further, at no public meeting was it clarified that discussions should be framed in the context of City initiated up-zoning for any parcel(s). The lack of public notice for a discussion of up-zoning parcels is very troubling. The SAP report needs to clearly indicate that: the existing UDO zoning designations are the base zoning throughout the SAP study area and any changes to the current UDO zoning contemplated in the SAP are to be privately initiated. For clarity of intention, please correct the draft report to remove any ambiguity about possible up-zoning at every discussion of zoning designations in the report. 3. Retain the existing R-6 zoning on Vanderbilt Ave that prevents both physical and visual encroachment from the building structures contemplated on Hillsborough Street. The homes on Vanderbilt Ave are an integral part of the West Raleigh Historic District and include the oldest structure associated with NC State University. These homes should retain the full UDO transition protections for R-6 properties. The notion of allowing limited alternative uses in existing homes on Vanderbilt may be acceptable but only to the extent that the current R-6 zoning protections and transitions are retained for this area. A special overlay district within the R-6 zoning allowing additional uses in these residential properties may be a good idea for this area and may also be applicable in the Person Street, Boylan Heights and other gentrifying areas within the city.4. The SAP needs to provide strategies to encourage housing and businesses attractive non-students along the Hillsborough Street corridor to achieve sustainable long term economic vitality. The SAP draft for Hillsborough Street states a desire to “preserve and add to diversity in all its forms” however there are no strategies to avoid the monoculture of student housing that is evolving through the corridor. A high concentration of student housing does not encourage movement between Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street; support diversity of residents, businesses and services envisioned along neighborhood edges to meet the stated objective for Hillsborough Street to become a destination street (for anyone other than students). The Hillsborough Street SAP needs to provide new strategies to encourage housing attractive to non-students including affordable owner-occupied opportunities like medium density townhomes and condominiums.</p> <p>I hope that these four important points will be included in the SAP final report.</p>	1 - Complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Networks, 2 - Improve and Expand Parks and Open Space, 3 - Increase Transit Options, 4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic, 5 - Plan for Adequate and Accessible Parking, 6 - Zone for the Future, 7 - -Promote Quality Design
Advisory Committee	<i>See attached document.</i>	1 - Complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Networks, 2 - Improve and Expand Parks and Open Space, 3 - Increase Transit Options, 4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic, 5 - Plan for Adequate and Accessible Parking, 6 - Zone for the Future, 7 - -Promote Quality Design
Environmental Advisory Board	E-W connection with downtown. No bike lanes without transit implementation; do not eliminate travel lanes without implementing transit. Questions about Van Dyke-Sutton and Glover. Increase pervious surface for sidewalks and other hardscape; reduce SW runoff. Enterprise – activity. Connecting open space.	2 - Improve and Expand Parks and Open Spaces, 3 - Increase Transit Options

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter J	<p>Will on street parking be allowed on Clark when the bike lanes are added? <i>(page 64)</i></p> <p>Whatever you do here, please do not removing a single parking space!!!! <i>(page 69)</i></p> <p>Clean-up and develop an inviting public space to learn more about Oberlin Village, the college, and enjoy the park. <i>(page 69)</i></p> <p>It appears that the connection would remove hourly parking that is sorely needed in this area. I would prefer parking over a connector. <i>(page 73)</i></p> <p>Examples please. <i>(page 90)</i></p> <p>fig 39. The building intensities on the north side of Hillsborough Street should be limited to 3 stories along the entire street. The south side building intensities depicted seem good to me. <i>(page 98)</i></p> <p>I do not support the level of redevelopment intensity depicted in this scenario Fig 38 (Although the redevelopment intensity along Wade Ave is acceptable as long as it there are transition zones and height step down to nearby neighborhood homes) <i>(page 97)</i></p> <p>I do not support the redevelopment scenario figure 40 on page 95. <i>(page 98)</i></p> <p>Vanderbilt Ave should remain R-6. R-10 removes too much of the transition zone to Hillsborough Street properties. No one wants the sunlight to their yard and home cut off and to live in the all day shadow of a 4 story building. <i>(page 99)</i></p> <p>The whole B-1 scenario including the zoning on Hillsborough and Vanderbilt is just way out of context for this neighborhood. I do not support anything about this scenario. <i>(page 99)</i></p>	2 - Improve and Expand Parks and Open Space, 5 - Plan for Adequate and Accessible Parking
Appearance Commission	<p>Would like to see more detail about what "additional study" recommendation for Vanderbilt Avenue entails.</p> <p>Was hoping to see more open space proposals, both public and private. Concerns that the UDO does not require enough quality, public open space as part of private development.</p> <p>Not supportive of city-initiated rezoning in terms of the zoning recommendations in the plan. Private rezoning where conditions can be offered is more appropriate and preferred.</p>	2 - Improve and Expand Parks and Open Space, 6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter DD	<p>I'm sure you have heard many comments about this area. With 4 large apartment complexes, little transportation besides cars and lots of traffic, this area is getting to be harder and harder to live and walk in. The idea of buildings being no more than 2-3 stories tall when next to established neighborhoods is being soundly ignored by planners and builders. I live on Everett. We were told by the city planners that there would be an 11 second difference in waiting for traffic after the 2 apartment buildings went up on Clark and Oberlin. That is ridiculous. There has been an increase of getting from Everett onto Oberlin 12-15 times that. The lights are not synchronized for easy turning and the traffic is busy at all times of the day. The traffic on Everett has increased several times also. Traffic calming devices would not be needed or wanted if the lights were synchronized so the main traffic would be on Clark/Oberlin not Everett. Also, waiting until 2 the apartments were built to arrange for better bus service means that residents will depend on their cars at the beginning and won't switch, because the cars have become habit. I have lived in many cities over the years: Berkeley, CA; Stockholm, Sweden; Boston and Yonkers, NY. They are all busy places that have public transportation that works well and makes traffic easier to negotiate. I have lived in Raleigh for 40 years and like that it is growing and much more interesting; but planners need to be ahead of the planning and not behind.</p>	3 - Increase Transit Options, 4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic
Commenter U	<p>I just called Vivian Ekstrom with City Planning to get her assistance with the Open Comment tool on the city website. She did not seem to be aware that the tool was cumbersome (at best). We had a friendly discussion about the mission of City Planning to provide a way for folks to weigh in on this small area plan in particular. As a matter of fact, I have a brand new Apple desk top with ample storage and processing capabilities. My wifi is top notch as i work from home and rarely have difficulties with downloading large amounts of data at high speed. This website is still trying to download this 144 page document 30 minutes after opening it up. Vivian took me to a page where a comment bubble was posted on page 64 and my new computer is just sitting there spinning in download mode. This is like using a 9 pound hammer to drive in finish nails. I told her that the open comment tool should not be considered a reliable tool as most people don't have time to wait for this download. At which Vivian said that folks can send her an e-mail. I told her that it would not be right down the road to say that they gave this open comment opportunity to folks, at this point the tool is non-functioning. At this juncture she left the conversation to go to a meeting, she was very polite and helpful and I hope that I was too. I told her that her boss and I are friends and have known each other for years and that I hoped Ken would be given the knowledge and recognize the importance of providing working tools for public comment. This feedback is sent to you all in an attempt to be helpful with the kindest regards and respect. Thanks for all you do.</p>	3 - Increase Transit Options, 4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic, 6 - Zone for the Future

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter TT	<p>My big concern with these plans has to do primarily with intent versus reality -- for instance, the UDO Infill Compatibility Standards do not live up to their stated intent and many residents, especially in older neighborhoods, are quite unhappy about that. I was in a Glenwood CAC meeting where Ken Bowers explicitly stated thatthe UDO Infill Compatibility Standards were originally tighter, but developers complained about them and so they were loosened. Most ordinary citizens were not paying attention to what was going on and we certainly can be blamed for that on some level. But then again, our livelihoods were not impacted as immediately and directly, so we didn't have the same vested interest in following and getting involved that developers did. So, while these plans sound good on the surface, it's important to make sure they live up to their stated intent. My second concern has to do with unforeseen implications. I have been in meetings where city council and/or city staffers have admitted they didn't think through the repercussions of all the high rises on Hillsborough Street that were built/are being built at the same time the street was put on a "diet" to restrict car traffic. Now they understand that all that traffic is flying through neighborhood streets that were never designed for them, but they don't have a good plan ready to go to alleviate the stress in the neighborhoods. Finally, I think the plans put too much emphasis on bikes. I understand they are important, but in a recent presentation to Glenwood CAC by Eric Lamb, it is clear that people commuting on bikes represent a minuscule portion of our population. And that most bikers are happy to recreationally enjoy the Greenway trails. So I would like more emphasis on mass transit improvements as a priority over bikes.</p>	3 - Increase Transit Options, 4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic, 6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter D	<p>Given the Comprehensive Plan’s goal to preserve and enhance neighborhoods and the no more than 3-story zoning height currently outlined in Raleigh’s Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) for development adjacent to established neighborhoods, the property between Furches and Montgomery should retain its 3-story entitlement. Instead of automatic ‘up zoning’ to 4 stories, any 3-story entitlement zoning currently in place should be considered for change only through a rezoning process based on details of individual projects and conditions at time of development. Borders of stable neighborhoods in the Small Area Plan should be treated consistently. The north side of Hillsborough adjacent to Cameron Park and the northeast part of University Park on Oberlin are bordered primarily by 3- story buildings and neighborhoods westward on the north side of Hillsborough Street should be as well. Overbuilding on height and mass creates a negative affect for neighborhoods adjoining Hillsborough by creating traffic and overflow parking issues, making neighborhood streets less safe for neighbors and their children. Varying heights, building types, and styles will make Hillsborough Street more appealing. As an already relatively narrow space, lining the street with stacks of housing creates a canyon effect rather than a welcoming destination. Hillsborough Street should be able to accommodate both the student population as well as older and longer-term residents. Finding a balance to keep one culture from dominating another should be a major objective and consideration for future development. By keeping the 3- story zoning height entitlements approved under the UDO in areas adjacent to neighborhoods, a wider variety of development and accommodations serving a broader diversity of residents is more likely to occur. Given the traffic congestion that already exists in the Small Area Plan and the recent focus for fast bus service on Western Boulevard, not Hillsborough Street, higher density development is more appropriate on the south side, not the north, of Hillsborough.</p>	3 - Increase transit Options, 6 - Zone for the Future, 7 - Promote Quality Design
Commenter F	<p>Good afternoon. I wanted to follow up the discussion and meeting with had with you, Eric Lamb and other city staff members regarding the Hillsborough / Cameron Village small area plans that are ongoing. Our team has designed a round-about for the intersection at Van Dyke and Oberlin Road for City of Raleigh’s consideration. We would like to formally submit this as one of our teams public comments for the Hillsborough / Cameron Village small area plan. We were trying to find a way to represent existing pavement and future new pavement so we used orange for existing and yellow for future which is the color scheme as used in most DOT public hearing maps. A group of property owners along Oberlin Road, including Chad Stelmok of Kimberly Development Group, Smedes York of York Properties, John Pharr of Regency Centers, and Jim Anthony of AACRE, have met and discussed a proposed roundabout at the intersection of Oberlin Road and Van Dyke Avenue. Based on the plans submitted to the City by Chad Stelmok as part of this public comment process, this group of stakeholders expressed unanimous support for a roundabout at the intersection of Oberlin Road and Van Dyke Avenue. The group agreed that a roundabout would be preferable to a center turn lane running the length of Oberlin Road, particularly given the cost of right-of-way acquisition and the impact of additional right-of-way on historic structures and residences along Oberlin Road in this area. Additionally, the group agreed that it would improve pedestrian safety crossing Oberlin Road. It is important to note that, as shown on the plans submitted to the City, no right-of-way acquisition or dedication would be required other than that which could be dedicated by Kimberly Development Group as part of its current site plan.<i>See attached Document.</i></p>	4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic
Commenter V	<p>The map on page 87 of the Cameron Village + Hillsborough Street Small Area plans, shows a center road median which eliminates left turns either out of or into Great Oaks Drive. Before commenting on the draft plan, I seek clarification that this is an intentional obstruction. If I should direct this question to someone else, please let me know. Thank you.</p>	4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic
Commenter X	<p>Yes, please realign the Cameron/Sutton/Smallwood triangle. Could this be a traffic circle? Or the plan on page 83 looks good. <i>(page 127)</i></p>	4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter UU	I am concerned at pages 88-89, which appear to show the phase two roundabouts as somehow part of this plan. This project was excluded from study, over the objections of many stakeholders. It did not receive review or comment during any part of this process. My only comment is that this year of work, with over 450 stakeholders involved, would indeed have been an excellent opportunity to scrutinize and integrate this plan. However, that did not happen, and to include it now, only at the last minute, is a breach of the process, not to mention simply misleading and wrong. In fact, there were no calls for roundabouts, no stakeholder comments requesting that roundabouts and medians be built on Hillsborough Street from any group or individual. That is what this plan should reflect. Please consider removing this section prior to reporting out the final plan so that the report accurately reflects the work and outcome of the the process.	4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic
Commenter VV	The Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan makes some great recommendations and furthers the right kind of vision for the area. In particular, the transportation enhancements it proposes--road diets, bicycle facilities, and better connectivity--are pretty bold in a good way. I have one very significant concern. Pages 86-87 of the draft report detail Oberlin Road improvements near the interchange with Wade Avenue. Most of these are good, however the use of a brick or similar median on Oberlin Road between Annapolis Drive (the Wade Ave exit) and Chester Road (by the doctors office) is a terrible idea. It would prevent left turns from Oberlin onto Great Oaks Drive, and similarly left turns from Great Oaks onto Oberlin. Where do you propose that residents of Great Oaks turn around if they wish to get onto Wade Avenue? Should they turn right from Great Oaks, then turn left and cut through the doctors' office parking lot, then turn right from Chester? Similarly--except even more difficult--if someone is southbound on Oberlin and wishes to turn onto Great Oaks, where should he/she turn around? It is unclear what benefit a median in that particular short segment would achieve. As an alternative, center turn lanes similar to what exists now are common features in "dieted" roads and safely achieve the need to remove turning vehicles from the travel lane. Although a median can be a refuge for pedestrians crossing a road, on that particular segment there are very few pedestrians crossing because there are few generators or attractions. Further, removal of the median would relieve any design pressure on lane widths for the vehicle lanes or bike lanes. Lastly, use of painted lines instead of a median could trim a few thousand dollars off the budget! While there are not that many residents of Great Oaks Drive, the burden this median would cause is enormous, and would doubtless result in attempts at dangerous U-turns or other maneuvers. I strongly urge you to find a solution that preserves left turn ability from/to Great Oaks Drive and Oberlin Road. Thank you.	4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic
Commenter WW	I do still agree with the issues highlighted regarding the Peace and Clark intersection. A colleague had an idea for a much less impactful solution which would also simplify another intersection that remains problematic in the plan. Bob suggested studying a roundabout at the intersection of Smallwood, Bellwood and Sutton. This would address the consultant's concern to provide a more direct way for west bound traffic to get to Oberlin Road via Smallwood Drive without the great expense of rebuilding the bridge and intersection at Peace/Clark. Likewise, eastbound traffic from Oberlin would have an improved route via Smallwood and then Bellwood south of the roundabout. This could be a trial approach to redistributing the east/west traffic that also improves the intersection at Sutton Drive and eliminates the conflict that the Bellwood intersections create by being so close to the two signals at Smallwood Drive. If later it is found that the roundabout has not adequately solved the east/west traffic issues, then an intersection improvement at Peace/Clark could still happen. I think it would be a prudent approach that frees up resources for other initiatives in the plan while keeping wayfinding and pedestrian movement between downtown and the rapidly growing neighborhoods in the study area more clear and direct, especially for visitors.	4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic
Commenter YY	As Chair of the Hillsborough CAC and Cameron Village resident, I served on the CV/Hills SAP Advisory Committee. Here is my feedback as requested on the draft plan: 1. The Enhanced Mobility Network Map on page 12 incorrectly shows Sutton Drive extended through to connect to Oberlin. The City Council actions in December, 2015 killed that possibility when they failed to require the connection to a development proposal. The map identifies the connection as a “local street” but at best we might get a pedestrian way, not even a bike path, much less a street for cars. 2. The same error is repeated on the maps on page 13, on page 55, on page 63, on page 75, on page 79, and on page 81. 3. Cameron Village desperately needs a way for cars to turn left (travel west) on Wade Ave from Daniels and Woodburn, and the ideal solution was to reach Oberlin via Sutton to use the Oberlin-Wade divided interchange. Without the extension of Sutton to Oberlin, we are trapped in our neighborhood as traffic on Wade continues to grow and is more or less constant in both directions all day (that is, not much of a peak). Page 42 shows 29,000 cars/day on Wade Ave between Daniels and St. Mary’s St., proving the need for traffic lights at one or both intersections (Wade/Daniels and/or Wade/Woodburn) to enable traffic to turn left (go west) on Wade from either or both streets. I note with satisfaction that a stoplight is recommended for Daniels/Wade on page 88. This stoplight is imperative. 4. Pages 89 shows the phase two roundabouts as though they are part of this plan. The phase two roundabout project was excluded from study over the objections of many stakeholders. It did not receive review or comment during any part of this process, nor was it even referenced in the “Previous Plans” list on page 29. I will continue to review the study and may get back to you with more comments.	4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter LL	<p>I wanted to register these public comments before the comment period closes: (1) I don’t support the revision to the Peace-Clark-Johnson-Smallwood intersection, and I am not sure our Neighborhood Association would support it either. Relatedly, I disagree with this statement below:<i>Analysis of traffic in the Cameron Village area indicates that the realignment of Clark-Peace-Smallwood will improve operations by better distributing traffic throughout the grid and taking pressure off of the most constrained intersection in the area (Clark/Oberlin). Given the conceptual nature of the recommendation, it is challenging to project cost.</i></p> <p>I am almost certain that traffic has NOT been analyzed for this hypothetical rearrangement, particularly since the building heights in Cameron Village were revised upward. If it has, I look forward to seeing that information, which we did not receive. And while it may be challenging to project cost, it seems to me likely that the main reason for omitting this projection is that the projection would be large enough to provide a further objection to the proposal. Numerous objections to this proposal were raised in the Advisory Committee, and very little was said to counter them. Much more work should be done before this is given serious consideration.</p> <p>(2) Regarding the neighborhood bikeway, I do not anticipate that the Neighborhood Association would support solutions that eliminate parking on the Cameron Park portion of West Johnson. I am disappointed that the statement below implies that no such option is being considered, when Eric confirmed that such an option does continue to be considered. <i>Neighborhood bikeways rarely involve any striping, but rather the use of pavement markings such as sharrows and signs to provide directional wayfinding and route confirmation. Bicycles travel with vehicular traffic. Typically, on-street parking is not effected (sic). Parked cars are compatible with the low-speed environment of a neighborhood bikeway.</i></p>	4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic, 5 - Plan for Adequate and Accessible Parking
Diehl Street & Williamson Drive (13 Households, 23 Residents)	<p>The homeowners below are interested in the enjoyment of their neighborhood located in the northern tip of District 1 of the referenced document. As such, we offer these comments to provide you our perspective on the neighborhood as you work through an obviously complicated process. (King Solomon may have had fewer interests to weigh.) In general, we support responsible commercial development in our residential area as necessary to provide convenience and competition for goods and services desired by the residents. Included would be sight and sound buffers between commercial and residential developments, adequate utility (including storm drainage management) and transportation infrastructure, the protection of residents’ safety, security and property values and adherence to the then existing “fabric” or character of a community. The published plan seems to embrace these principles while preparing for the eventual higher density. At present, however, we are concerned about two items which we believe merit further study: 1. The proposed zoning change on pages 100-101 to the commercial area along Annapolis Drive and Wade Avenue from OX-3 to OX-5 will adversely impact the character of the surrounding residential area. Of particular concern are the western ends of Diehl Street and Williamson Drive, where there currently are insufficient sight and sound buffers. We note that these changes are subject to the Transition Requirements referred to on pages 106-107 but are unsure exactly what that means as applied to specific projects. 2. The proposed median on Oberlin Road on pages 84-85 which blocks Great Oaks Drive appears to create an unsafe situation. Drivers turning left onto or out of that street will instead be forced to turn right and then be inclined to execute a u-turn at some point on busy Oberlin Road. With the addition of the proposed bike lanes in this area, this creates a dangerous situation for bikers and motorists alike.</p>	4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic, 6 - Zone for the Future

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter Z	<p>The following comments are in no particular order of interest or concern: I agree that "Hillsborough Street is challenged by its student-oriented perception" (quote from the Plan) And I agree with the vision stated in the Plan to “. . . preserve and add to diversity in all its forms: buildings and architecture; housing types and residents; visitors and patrons; employment and businesses; amenities and services; experiences and recreation.” For these reasons I cannot understand why so much obviously student-targeted residential developments are being considered/allowed/approved on Hillsborough Street. NCSU officials acknowledge that the University will not be increasing the number of undergraduate students and that, in fact, State needs to fill currently underutilized dormitory space. Yet, more residential projects attractive to undergraduate students rather than a more diverse pool of renters and/or buyers are approved. If a diverse residential population, interested in a diversity of retail and food businesses would be desirable for such a distinguished corridor as Hillsborough Street can be once again, residential development must lean now toward young professionals and the down-sizing baby boomers who would like to give up their homes in the surrounding neighborhoods and move to apartments and condominiums that keep them in the areas they have enjoyed in the Hillsborough Street environs.</p> <p>A concern for retail parking is noted in the Plan. Perhaps I’ve missed it, but I have a deep concern about the lack of adequate residential parking for projects developed on Hillsborough Street that will force car owners to park on surrounding neighborhood streets. The neighborhoods on the north side of Hillsborough Street were developed essentially as sub-urban neighborhoods. And they were developed when a family, at best, had one car—and many residences did not include off-street parking on their property. Therefore, these neighborhood streets are already being used for parking by the adjacent residences; in many cases, they are already lined with cars.</p> <p>I understand that the reduction in traffic lanes and addition of roundabouts on Hillsborough Street are intended to slow traffic. And I understand and completely agree that more dense development on Hillsborough Street is desirable for the City. Again, I have deep concern about the effect that increased traffic (and it is disingenuous to think that automobile traffic will turn into bus, bicycle, or pedestrian traffic at the same rate projects—residential, retail, or office—are being developed) will have on the sub-urban neighborhoods north of Hillsborough Street. There has not been adequate consideration and evaluation of the extent to which traffic will flow onto neighborhood streets, which will become a part of the transit network as people avoid the intentionally slowed traffic on Hillsborough Street. Project approval must be better coordinated with its traffic flow (and parking) consequences.</p> <p>Sustainable growth along Hillsborough Street must be balanced with sustaining established and thriving neighborhoods, which could lose their desirability if overflow traffic and parking issues make them less desirable.</p> <p>I understand that the Comprehensive Plan acknowledges an interest in preserving and enhancing neighborhoods and that the UDO currently specifies a no more than three-story zoning height for development adjacent to established neighborhoods. An automatic increase in height for any existing three-story entitlement zoning is not being realistic about the different characteristics of sections along and bordering Hillsborough Street on the north and south sides. The three-story limit should continue to be the standard zoning that can be altered, based on particular circumstances. The property on Hillsborough Street between Furches and Montgomery streets is a case in point. Because the “neighborhood” begins immediately behind that property, it should retain its three-story entitlement.</p>	4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic, 6 - Zone for the Future

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Great Oaks Court (10 Households, 16 Residents)	<p>Several proposals in the draft Cameron Village + Hillsborough Street Small Area Plans for District 1, if implemented, would adversely impact the local character and appearance of the existing single-family residential fabric surrounding the office parcels on Annapolis Drive. An additional burden for the residents of Great Oaks Dr. would be the elimination of left turn access into and out of the neighborhood if a hard median on Oberlin Rd. were to block the street. This response to request for comment is respectfully submitted to the City of Raleigh planning department for their consideration. Zoning Refinements: Zoning refinements to the north side Annapolis drive parcels from OX-3 to OX-5 would situate increased height intensity and bulking directly adjacent to single family residences, some located within the Oberlin Village Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District (NCOD). The plan's "Promote Quality Design" section contains strong policies to protect the scale and feel of adjacent neighborhoods. However, the office development on Annapolis Dr. appears to be exempt from these restrictions based on general observations of the street's topography. If the north side Annapolis Dr. office parcels were subject to transition zone requirements, the specific parcel geometry may prevent effective implementation of step down transitioning.</p> <p>Specific concerns are as follows: Figure 41 Proposed Refinements to Zoning proposes Annapolis Dr. OX-3 to OX-5 increase in height allowance to 5 stories or 75 ft. With no transition restrictions in place the encroachment into the existing residential neighborhoods would erode the single family, owner occupied character. The Arlington Place subdivision, consisting of Great Oaks Dr. is within the Oberlin Village NCOD and building heights conform to the 25 ft. restriction. Any transitions from heights greater than 50 ft. of development on the north side Annapolis parcels would represent significant amplification of scale and incongruent visual integration with the "built environmental characteristics" of the existing community fabric. Figure 45 Transition Zones for the Cameron Village Study Area delineates the north side Annapolis Dr. parcels as subject to transition requirements however two proposed exemptions from these requirements would allow encroachment into adjacent neighborhoods. The "Cameron Village Zoning Refinements" section on page 100 provides protection to "adjacent single family neighborhoods" by restricting building height to 3 stories. However, the Annapolis Dr. mixed use parcels are exempted from this requirement due to their "lower starting elevation. The actual ground floor elevations of existing Annapolis Dr. office buildings are not consistently lower, and in some cases, equal to or higher than the residential parcels on adjacent streets. In cases where the adjacent residential lot is higher than the ground floor elevation of an office mixed use building, the actual elevation difference is not sufficient to accommodate an additional 2 stories or 50 ft, in height from existing height entitlement. The "Promote Quality Design" policies for transition in scale and height protect single family neighborhoods. Policy applications on page 106 provide that the area "North of the Office District along Wade Avenue" is subject to transition policies but the office parcels along the north side of Annapolis Dr. are not explicitly listed and this may be interpreted as an exemption from transition policies. (ie the parcels are not "along" Wade Avenue but "along" Annapolis Dr.) The "Promote Quality Design" policies as shown on page 110 recognize that shallow lots present difficulties in implementing "step down transitioning" with a minimum lot depth of 200 ft. for effective transitioning. The geometry of the Annapolis Dr. parcels would present challenges to effective height transitions. Rezoning from OX-3 to OX-5 with insufficient lot configuration to implement transition strategy, allows massing intensity without protection. This type of development would threaten the low density character and neighborhood scale of adjacent single family homes.</p> <p>Oberlin Road Median: The proposed Oberlin Rd. "brick or plantable" median is shown on page 87 as spanning the entrance of Great Oaks Dr. and depending on implementation may eliminate left turn access into and out of the neighborhood. The inability to turn left would impose a significant burden for the residents. Great Oaks Drive is not a through street with secondary ingress/egress routes. To travel south onto Oberlin Rd. if left turn access is prevented from Great Oaks Dr., the residents would have no alternative turn around strategies, which would not impose upon private parking lots in the area or make an excessive loop through adjacent streets. If left turns onto Great Oaks are eliminated by medians, the turn-around strategy would necessitate either an imposition on the nearest private parking lot on Annapolis Dr. or travel through a traffic signal. All homes on Great Oaks Dr. are built with first floor master bedrooms, to accommodate folks with restricted mobility. The elimination of left turn access on Great Oaks drive would impose a burden on the several elderly residents, who continue to live in their own homes. Emergency vehicle access would be impaired resulting in response time delays to these residents' needs.</p> <p>Requested Consideration: Additional study of the north side Annapolis Dr. area, including engagement of residential property owners, with specific site topography and existing ground floor elevations relative to adjacent neighborhoods to determine a redevelopment height consistency with 3 story restrictions within the Quality Design policy. Before adopting refinements from an OX-3 to OX-5 zone for all parcels on Annapolis Dr., consider specific parcel geometry and feasibility of effective step down transitioning. If the step down transitions are precluded by lot geometry, the resulting mass conflicts between a 5 story redevelopment and single family neighborhood may be resolved by retaining the OX-3 zoning as adopted in the City of Raleigh UDO. Develop Oberlin Rd. median design alternatives to protect existing left turn access for Great Oaks Dr.</p>	4 - Distribute and Calm Traffic, 6 - Zone for the Future, 7 - Promote Quality Design

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter T	I am directly affected by the small area plan changes to Hillsborough Street. Keeping the 3-story height entitlements (limits) in place makes good sense as we move forward with our Hillsborough Street re-visioning process. Here are the reasons I believe this is important. 1. I favor the original vision for the Hillsborough Street Plan that provided for a maximum of 3 stories because an overwhelming majority of neighbors support it. See snapshot graphic from post-it notes at the public meeting (insert). 2. I believe our neighborhood spoke clearly on this subject during the Z-35-13 zoning case, those points are still relevant and the Raleigh City Council supported our points. 3. over building on height and massing will cause a negative effect for adjoining neighborhoods like Cameron Park and University Park by creating overflow parking and traffic which can make streets unsafe for our neighbor’s and their children. 4. I believe that Hillsborough Street has a lot to offer both the NCSU student population as well as other residents in the area. Finding a balance to keep one culture from dominating another should be a major objective, such guidelines provide our leadership a good sound starting point for development. 5. Too many apartment buildings could create a mono-culture that we need to avoid. 6. I am directly affected by the changes to Hillsborough Street and I support good sound stewardship of managed growth to protect these areas of concern for future generations.	5 - Plan for Adequate and Accessible Parking, 6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter Y	First this has been a very rewarding experience and I want to thank all that were involved in getting us so close. The staff spent who knows how many hours at public meetings with us along with a large number of hours outside of these meetings to bring this information together. Although we had a few hick ups along the way, the staff was very dedicated to advancing this small area plan and they should feel good about where we are going. Following are my comments to the draft plan: 1. None of the economic findings and evaluations are really included. This should be a separate section in this final plan which addresses the economic findings. One items form the scoping document was to form a detailed market study for the area focusing on neighborhood needs and uses not currently being satisfied. 2. The Vanderbilt area is noted as additional study. We had a very good consensus with the existing property owners and with the advisory committee to advance this to a commercial office and residential looking neighborhood. The vast majority of the comments I have seen also endorsed this plan following up with a PD special district for this area. The last statement on page 103 seems to be out of character for what the overall feedback was for this area. 3. The parking section needs work. In the second paragraph they state: “Existing parking is right at the accepted norms for urban contexts”. This statement is unrealistic for the HS area. Anyone who lives, works, owns property here and plays on HS, know that this is just not true. Starting with this statement really tells a story how little the consultant understands the parking issues for the area. Their existing inventory includes not only the public spaces but private lots as well, which do not allow public parking. They (from the scoping document) were to propose long range parking requiremetns to meet the needs of HS but they have only listed strategies which many may not be practical for HS. We were supposed to get a long range strategy and this has not been provided. 4. The do note that the solutions will have to include on-street pakrign, new structured parking, improved wayfinding and parking technologies (which may or may not be practical). 5. The polarized objectives related to parking was not discussed nor was this indicated that this was to be included in the final report. It does not represent the meetings nor the discussions which took place. This should be removed. 6. The top 10 emerging trends noted is not valid for HS. This was shown for the first time now in the draft. Where did this come from and why was this not discussed previously. We need more spaces for daytime parking. The students take up most of the metered and other spaces throughout the neighborhood. Where is the solution to help resolve this issue. 7. We need a strategy whereby our patrons know that they can find a space to park to come to our businesses along HS. Where is the plan? 8. The VoicePark system is only used in cities that are more than twice the size of Raleigh. How does Raleigh, much less HS afford such an expensive system? 9. They made mention of a re-design of the on street parking and that they can gain 100 spaces? Where is this plan? We could use it as park of this plan. 10. They make mention of expanding on street metered parking. Where is this plan and where would we put it? 11. They mention P3 development of new parking. Great idea but what is the motivator for the private developer? 12. The closing statement on parking is all over the place. This should be a good summary of what the options are going forward. 13. The plan for implementation needs to be prioritized so that the City can follow through with the areas by the priority. These are areas which I feel that need to be addressed so that the plan can be the best plan it can and does not fall short of the intended scoping and desires of the neighborhood.	5 - Plan for Adequate and Accessible Parking, 6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter FF	My family and I are residents on 3006 Ruffin St and have lived in University Park since 1999. I am writing during the Open Comment Period to express our concern of the proposed apartment complex on Hillsborough St, between Furches and Montgomery St. I am directly affected by the small area plan changes to Hillsborough Street. Keeping the 3-story height entitlements (limits) in place makes good sense as we move forward with our Hillsborough Street re-visioning process. Here are the reasons I believe this is important. 1. I favor the original vision for the Hillsborough Street Plan that provided for a maximum of 3 stories because an overwhelming majority of neighbors support it. See the snapshot graphic from post-it notes at the small area plan public meeting. 2. I believe our neighborhood spoke clearly on this subject during the Z-35-13 zoning case, those points are still relevant and the Raleigh City Council supported our points. 3. Over-building on height and massing will cause a negative effect for adjoining neighborhoods like Cameron Park and University Park by increasing traffic and needs for overflow parking which can make streets unsafe for our neighbor’s and their children. 4. I believe that Hillsborough Street has a lot to offer both the NCSU student population as well as other residents in the area. Finding a balance to keep one culture from dominating another should be a major objective, such guidelines provide our leadership a good sound starting point for future development. 5. Too many apartment buildings could create a mono-culture that we need to avoid. 6. I love Raleigh and am directly affected by the changes to Hillsborough Street and I support good sound stewardship of managed growth to protect these areas of concern for future generations.	5 - Plan for Adequate and Accessible Parking, 6 - Zone for the Future

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter A	I live with my family on Dixie Trail in Raleigh. While we support improvements to Hillsborough Street, It is important to us to maintain the residential qualities of our neighborhood as well, and therefore, we ask the city to limit the height of commercial, office and mixed use and multifamily buildings to 2 stories (ground floor plus one additional floor) on the North side of Hillsborough between Henderson St and Gardner St. We are concerned that higher, 4 story buildings will obstruct sun light, horizon views, and would significantly and negatively impact our neighborhood. We are especially concerned with the potential negative impacts of 4 story buildings at 7 Dixie trail, which is currently a former home being used for business purposes, and 9 Bagwell which is currently a parking lot, and the construction of tall buildings on the corner of Hillsborough and Dixie Trail and the entry ways to other parts of the neighborhood. Thank you for considering my comment.	6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter C	I am writing to ask that the three-story limit be maintained for the Hillsborough St. small area plan. I live on Clark Avenue between Shepherd and Henderson streets, and I have lived in the University Park neighborhood for fifteen years. My children play here with their friends, and it is very important to us that the area around Hillsborough St. continue to be a place where families can enjoy a good quality of life while living near students and the university. Allowing greedy developers to build higher buildings is short-sighted and will destroy our neighborhood. Hillsborough street between Gardner and Faircloth should look like Hillsborough St. near Cameron Park: a walkable thoroughfare with three-story buildings that include apartments, restaurants, and retail.	6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter E	<p>Thank you for speaking to us tonight. As Donna mentioned, please reexamine the sticky notes from the public meeting on the north side of Hillsborough Street between Faircloth and Dixie. I believe that you will see that the about 90% of numerous notes mention three stories as the preference when any mention is made of heights. In that light, I would like to understand more about how the planning group reached the decision to shift most of those parcels from three to four stories as a height entitlement. I am sure that you will agree that all the factors in civic decisions should be available to all of the stakeholders. Please provide me a copy of the 'market analysis' that pushes toward four stories on the north side of Hillsborough Street between Faircloth and Dixie, which you mentioned tonight as a factor in the planning group's decision. I will appreciate receiving this by Thursday morning so that I can take it into account when I send my overall comments, which I have not yet done. Numerous citizens in our area are doing our best to be heard. Thank you in advance for listening. An additional story of height entitlement may seem 'modest' to you, but we have repeatedly stated multiple reasons why it is of concern to our neighborhood. There's a lot more to a vital and stable city than stacked rental apartments. We are doing our best to protect diversity of options in the urban core for ourselves and generations to come. We truly believe that one day it will be understood why our efforts were important for the continuing health of this great city.</p> <p>In reviewing my message this morning, please know that I do understand that the planning group has not created the height entitlement by itself. You can transpose the message to 'Why was four stories recommended by the planning group as policy guidance or as a future zoning entitlement, if further action to enact the latter comes from the City Council'? If this is not stated exactly correctly either, I trust that you can interpret what I am trying to ask while not being completely fluent in the language of professional city planners. I believe that in most cases we do not know what another person intends to say, even if they misspeak a word or phrase, but I wanted to be sure that my questions were not derailed by technicalities as you read the message. I look forward to receiving a copy of the 'market analysis' that was part of making this recommendation.</p>	6 - Zone for the Future

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter E	<p>I live within two blocks of Hillsborough Street on the western side of the University Park Neighborhood. I believe that the continuing stability of this neighborhood is key to the future of Raleigh. On a worldwide basis, people increasingly want to ‘put down roots’ in desirable and long-term housing closer to the urban core. Raleigh is part of this trend, as shown by the many young families and numerous children around my home. We are lucky to have such housing already available, and we need to protect it for the future. I oppose increasing the height entitlements on the north side of Hillsborough Street between Faircloth and Dixie to four stories. I oppose four stories in the context of automatic up-zoning or policy guidance. The interests of the immediate area and larger Raleigh are better served by retaining the lower (mainly three story) height entitlements as established by the UDO. My reasons for opposing four story height entitlements or policy guidance in this area are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• These are relatively narrow parcels immediately adjacent to mostly one and two story single family residences. The most compelling context of the parcels on the western end of Hillsborough Street is the University Park Neighborhood.• Neighborhood residents have consistently voiced a majority preference for 3 stories on the north side of Hillsborough Street adjacent to the University Park neighborhood. Please look at the 90% of the sticky notes from the public meeting in the Talley Student Union that favor 3 stories in this area.• Traffic from these parcels will mostly flow back through the neighborhood due to inability of new projects to have entrances and exists on Hillsborough Street, and/or difficult or prohibited turns onto Hillsborough Street as well as congestion on the main corridor. Excess traffic will ultimately destabilize the neighborhood, so density and use of infill development along Hillsborough Street must be carefully discussed and monitored.• Consideration of rezoning for infill development should be based on details about the projects and conditions that safeguard the interests of all stakeholders in the area. The interests of the neighborhood are best served by maintaining the mainly three story UDO height entitlements. In the future, developers might in some cases present specifics and conditions of potential rezoning cases that may add value to the neighborhood for further consideration.• I notice that Cameron Park and the northeast part of University Park on Oberlin are mainly bordered by 3 story buildings in the proposed plan. Stable neighborhoods near Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street should be treated consistently on their borders, with three story heights that are more consistent with the height of single family residences.• The view of the Noell Consulting Group that this area will likely need to be redeveloped at heights greater than four stories is being proven wrong in practice. Development groups have expressed intent to redevelop two major parcels at three stories. Three contiguous parcels, between Montgomery Street and Furches, have already been the subject of extensive dialog between neighbors, the developer, and the City, and that civic process should be honored by no change to the UDO three story height entitlements.• The Noell report is interesting, but is is limited by the assigned scope of ‘Hillsborough Street Corridor’. Considering the parcels adjacent to the road without reference to the University Park neighborhood is like planning for the management and continued health of a river without knowing if it flows through desert, farmland, or a major city. The neighborhood context on the north side of Hillsborough Street between Dixie and Faircloth shows that the UDO height entitlements of mainly three stories in this area are the most appropriate and do not need revision. Thank you for your consideration of these thoughts. Please retain the UDO height entitlements on the north side of Hillsborough Street between Faircloth and Dixie.	6 - Zone for the Future

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter I	<p>I would like to add my comments to the proposed changes that are being considered in the Small Area Plan, specifically the change from a maximum of 3 stories for projects increasing it to 4 stories. Our neighborhood has worked diligently in expressing our feelings about the project being planned on Hillsborough Street between Furches and Montgomery Streets. We have attended CAC meetings, city council meetings, met with members of the city council and with the Developer and his attorney. This has been a long and rigorous process that has been very trying and thankfully productive. We feel that all parties have discussed in good faith how this project would work best for the developer and hopefully best for the neighborhood. Our concerns have to do with too much student housing on Hillsborough Street creating a monolithic culture. We encouraged a project that would be appealing to graduate students, young professionals and empty nesters. Our neighborhood is a wonderful place to live with a diverse set of neighbors and a relaxed and beautiful setting. I personally have great concerns about parking issues and traffic . We are already seeing major traffic congestion and cut throughs in our neighborhood with the increased development along Hillsborough Street and I am seeing the same throughout the general area particularly in Cameron Village. Development with a emphasis on walkable lifestyles is great but traffic and parking are a reality and must be factored in. We are a border area to this type of development and I feel that there needs to be an appropriate transition between new high density development and long established residential neighborhoods. We can live with three stories but four stories will be too tall for the surrounding area. and the parking for increased density will put stress on parking on our narrow neighborhood streets and increase traffic. We have not seen any final plans from the current developer of the Furches/Montgomery property but he has agreed in principle to building a project not more than three stories with at least two separate buildings as opposed to the original developers plan of a single five story building that would run the entire length of the properties purchased. We know that the land is going to be developed and our goal is to encourage smart development. I personally feel good about our conversations with the current developer and even though I have not seen plans I feel that he is sensitive to our concerns. The Small area plan under consideration would allow for four stories in many areas of the city including our neighborhood. While I have no idea how this change would affect the developer of the Furches/Montgomery project which is directly beside my property, I can only imagine that given the regulatory change to four stories that he would have to consider that as an option even after many good faith meetings that resulted in a good feeling by the neighborhood. I would encourage a three story limit on the north side of Hillsborough Street. A four story building would tower above our Westoak townhouse community blocking sunlight and rising above the tree level. I understand that the Small Area plan affects a large part of the city and I know that there are many people affected. I do know how it would affect our neighborhood and I am hoping that any development in our area will consider an appropriate scale considering the surrounding neighbors and consider projects that have a diverse offering that will be attractive to all types of residents and not just the undergraduate population that has been the focus of the most recently built projects down the street with the Stanhope being the model. Please consider this as a strongly held opinion that increasing the three story limit to four stories across the city with a generalized plan not allowing for specific concerns about projects proposed for transitional areas next to long established neighborhoods is a bad idea and should not be adopted.The current UDO creates balance in areas adjacent to established neighborhoods and will allow for a wider variety of development and accommodations serving a broader diversity of residents. Thank you for your consideration. If you could be so kind as to confirm that you have received this email, I would greatly appreciate it.</p>	6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter M	<p>Thank you for reading this comment on the above referenced Plan. The City spent a great deal of money, energy and time over many years developing a new zoning layout for many areas of Raleigh. There was ample opportunity during this long process for citizens and staff to express their desires- and the end result was the OX-3 along Hillsborough Street where appropriate. I believe it is patently unacceptable and inappropriate for the City Staff to have the ability to up-zone anything without going through the proper channels of any rezoning case. Each case must be subject to the same scrutiny. If this is allowed to happen, how can any citizen feel comfortable with what the elected officials approve/disapprove if the Staff can "trump" their decision. That is what would happen with the Staff being given this unilateral authority That is why the citizens elected them- staff members are hired to provide services as directed by our governing body- not in lieu of what the Council says. I urge this procedure to be DISallowed and keep everything above board, transparent and consistent. Thank you-</p>	6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter N	<p>I had difficulty making comments for the Hillsborough and Cameron Village Small Area Plans so I'm sending them to you. First, I want to strongly recommend that there is NO ZONING of more than 3 stories where it meets ANY single family residential. I would like to add that the parcels on Hillsborough Street between Furches and Montgomery should only be 3 stories to support the transition to the neighborhood. I don't see any justification for buildings to be taller than 3 stories where it is directly adjacent to single family residences in either of the small area plans. Also, this should be recommendations with the actual rezoning to be done at the time rezoning is requested.</p>	6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter N	<p>I forgot to add my comments and the comments that I heard from the Wade CAC. The residents who LIVE on Vanderbilt DO NOT want their residential street to be rezoned to anything other than R-6 without an intense participation with the people who actually LIVE there. This would be a huge mistake to recommend ANY rezoning of residential area's without direct input and involvement with the residents. The UPHA neighborhood AND the Wade CAC DO NOT support any rezoning of either side of Vanderbilt.</p>	6 - Zone for the Future

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter R	Donna Bailey recommended that I email you with comments on the Hillsboro St small area plan because the COR website has not responded to my comments all week. Frankly, I find this unconscionable. I was able to view the small area plan document where I found that Vanderbilt Avenue has been rezoned to R10 and the north side of Hillsborough St near Brooks avenue has been rezoned to NX4. Many of us who live on Vanderbilt strongly recommended against R10 because it eliminates a 50' buffer between us and adjacent commercial uses such as NX 4. I live at the corner of brooks and Vanderbilt avenues. The NCSU Fisheries department housed in the little stone house next to me has also been rezoned NX4. Thus I may have a 60' tall apartment block 15 feet from my little house which I built and love. With the new roundabout construction starting soon , my property is about to be threatened and Vanderbilt avenue, which was once a decent residential street , will be transformed. I strongly recommend that the COR consider a more thoughtful , fine grained study of changes to this historically diverse and creative area.	6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter S	As a resident of the University Park neighborhood for 23 years, I have seen seen Hillsborough Street 's vitality wax and wane. It is very exciting to see Hillsborough Street thriving. However, as a resident in a neighborhood that is adjacent to Hillsborough Street towards the western end on the north side, it is my hope that future development of Hillsborough Street will include a partnership with the neighbors, given the Comprehensive Plan's goal is to preserve and enhance neighborhoods. I wish to speak in favor of the UDO's condition of the height development condition not to exceed the 3-story entitlement when development is being planned for properties along Hillsborough Street adjacent to established neighborhoods. It is my hope that future development along Hillsborough Street will remain consistent with the 3-story development in place as the Small Area Plan addresses development that borders stable neighborhoods such as ours (University Park neighborhood - the Furches and Montgomery Street area). Further, I ask that consideration be given to the lasting impact of development along Hillsborough Street: height and mass having negative effects on our neighborhood, traffic and overflow parking being of primary concern. The safety of our neighborhoods hopefully will be of real concern that over development will bring. Recognizing that variety is desired, creating massive buildings could create less desirable outcomes, increased traffic and a canyoning effect, neither of which is appealing for those traveling along Hillsborough Street. Lastly, I am hopeful that a balance will be found to include the student population, proposed growth and preservation of adjacent neighborhoods that includes the long tern residents. Perhaps the south side of Hillsborough Street is the better option if higher density development is the goal. Thank you for giving these concerns full consideration. May this great city continue in its quest to be a great city and may Hillsborough Street's future development be an example of why Raleigh is a great city- shared vision and compromise between city government and residents.	6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter BB	I write this message as a resident of the University Park/Wilmont neighborhood and to express my strongest possible opposition to the “up zoning” proposed in the Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan for the north side of Hillsborough from Faircloth to Dixie Trail. As you know, this area is adjacent to a well-established neighborhood that deserves protection from overbuilding along Hillsborough Street and appropriate transitions from Hillsborough Street to the neighborhood. The three-story height limit indicated in Raleigh’s Unified Development Ordinance is appropriate and provides for sufficient density for the redevelopment of this region of Hillsborough Street. The University Park neighborhood is stable, provides a diversity of housing options for a diverse population, and has enjoyed significant investment by homeowners in renovations and new builds. Degrading this neighborhood with inappropriate (4-story plus) adjacent development and the resulting increased traffic would be a mistake. The various core neighborhoods in Raleigh are one its great attractions and strengths. Please do everything you can to preserve them. Thank you for your consideration.	6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter HH	<p>Given the Comprehensive Plan's goal to preserve and enhance neighborhoods and the no more than 3-story zoning height currently outlined in Raleigh's Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) for development adjacent to established neighborhoods, the property between Furches and Montgomery should retain its 3-story entitlement. Instead of automatic "up zoning", any 3-story entitlement zoning currently in place should be considered for change only through a rezoning process based on details of individual projects and conditions at time of development. <i>(page 102-103)</i></p> <p>Transition zone height requirements should be applied to two adjacent lots continuing to Montgomery St. that also back-up to two story residential structures (Westoak property) <i>(page 108)</i></p>	6 - Zone for the Future

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter II	<p>I am a resident of University Park, and more specifically, my husband and I own a home that is next to one of the proposed housing developments on Hillsborough St. Based on the Cameron Village- Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan report recently posted, I understand that the OX-3 zoning could change to be "up-zoned" to allow a 4-story height. Given the Comprehensive Plan’s goal to preserve and enhance neighborhoods and the no more than 3-story zoning height currently outlined in Raleigh’s Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) for development adjacent to established neighborhoods, the property between Furches and Montgomery should retain its 3-story entitlement. Borders of stable neighborhoods in the Small Area Plan should be treated consistently. The north side of Hillsborough adjacent to Cameron Park and the northeast part of University Park on Oberlin are bordered primarily by 3- story buildings and neighborhoods westward on the north side of Hillsborough Street should be as well. Overbuilding on height and mass creates a negative affect for neighborhoods adjoining Hillsborough by creating traffic and overflow parking issues, making neighborhood streets less safe for neighbors and their children. Varying heights, building types, and styles will make Hillsborough Street more appealing. As an already relatively narrow space, lining the street with stacks of housing creates a canyon effect rather than a welcoming destination. Hillsborough Street should be able to accommodate both the student population as well as older and longer-term residents. Finding a balance to keep one culture from dominating another should be a major objective and consideration for future development. By keeping the 3- story zoning height entitlements approved under the UDO in areas adjacent to neighborhoods, a wider variety of development and accommodations serving a broader diversity of residents is more likely to occur. Thank you for your time and consideration. We are a passionate neighborhood that wants to support necessary growth and development for the area, while still allowing for a good quality of life that encourages more long-term residents to stay and contribute to the economic growth of this city.</p>	6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter OO	<p>I would like to echo Frank's comments. Vanderbilt must not be rezoned from R-6 to R-10. We need the buffer area required under the R-6 zoning. The 5 story buildings recommended for Hillsborough St in the blocks along Vanderbilt are too high and we are being treated differently than the folks in Cameron Park where the heights are 3 story. On page 92 of the report, there is an editorial comment under the parking signage, "Confusing Parking Signage". Its not at all confusing, just read it. Our "U" district works very well and we want it preserved.</p>	6 - Zone for the Future
Commenter XX	<p>I am sending this note to support friendly development for the space between Furches and Montgomery St. Please give strong consideration to preserve and enhance our neighborhood by keeping development no more than 3 stories. To consider building higher could create a negative affect for neighborhoods adjoin Hillsborough by creating traffic and overflow parking issues. in turn, this could make neighborhood streets less safe for neighbors and their children. Thank you for giving this matter the attention it requires and thank you for being so open and receptive to the voices of the neighborhood.</p>	6 - Zone for the Future

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter Q	<p>I have a few comments after reviewing the plan and hearing a presentation. First, regarding the survey I took about the plan. I was dismayed that I often was presented with a number of choices none of which I approved, but one of which I had to choose to move forward. I would consider that a serious flaw in the survey at the least. A cynical person might wonder if the survey was set up that way. In 1999, I was delighted to move into a beautiful, historic home in an historic neighborhood bordering a campus. I actually like living in a neighborhood with a diverse group of people, including students. I also believe that Raleigh must make many difficult decisions in order to accommodate the amazing growth it has been experiencing. I just hope that we will not sacrifice what made our city a desirable place to live in a rush to make those changes. I also hope that planners will listen as closely to its current residents in those neighborhoods experiencing rapid change as it does to those who wish to benefit from development in those areas. I am heartened by recent decisions in the city that have valued incorporating the historical with new development, such as the Dillon property. I also hope that traffic planners will listen to the people who are actually driving in the neighborhoods for anecdotal information where development is happening in addition to statistical info. For example, I note that when I try to travel from my home to my downtown office during the weekday that there is a definite slow down in traffic from Cameron Village through to Glenwood on Peace Street. I also note that there is a definite slow down problem on Hillsborough in the area around Fairview o weekdays, and I know that I have definitely been diverting into the neighborhood when possible to avoid these problems. I was also somewhat heartened to learn that no big plans are currently being proposed for development on Vanderbilt in the University Park neighborhood. Though I believe that sensible development -- 3-4 story mixed use buildings -- along Hillsborough could benefit the entire area, I believe that having a pleasant neighborhood environment offering homes for university staff and faculty across from campus is very important. I definitely would not support development on that street. I also note that design attractiveness was mentioned in the plan presentation but it seems to focus on (diverse) building height. I have been dismayed by some of the building design showing up along Hillsborough. I think much of it is unattractive now and will not age well. We may just be replicating some of the unattractive design problems that now exist on Hillsborough from earlier building booms. Thank you for the opportunity to be heard regarding planning for the area in which I live.</p> <p>Actually, I had forgotten to comment on the parking situation at Cameron Village. I know that you probably consider that the concern of York Properties, but I do note that the state has an ABC store there and the public library is there. It is now often difficult to impossible to find parking not only at Harris Teeter but also elsewhere in the center--particularly on weekends.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to be heard.</p>	6 - Zone for the Future, 7 - Promote Quality Design
Commenter AA	<p>Please see my comments below regarding the Planning Commission's considering an "automatic up zoning" of certain properties. My comments are particularly aimed at the property between Furches and Montgomery on Hillsborough, which lies one and a half blocks from our home. As you are aware, our neighborhood has been involved, enthusiastically, with potential developers of this site to achieve a win/win development for both the developer and the neighborhood. We love living in a more urban area of Raleigh and are not against development. We simply want a development that fits in with our neighborhood and does not detract from our neighborhood's well established character and quality of life. 1) Given the Comprehensive Plan's goal to preserve and enhance neighborhoods and the no more than 3-story zoning height currently outlined in Raleigh's UDO for development adjacent to established neighborhoods, the property between Furches and Montgomery should retain its 3-story entitlement. 2) Instead of automatic "up-zoning," any 3-sotry entitlement zoning currently in place should be considered for change only through a rezoning process based on details of individual project and conditions at time of development. 3) Borders of stable neighborhoods in the Small Area Plan should be treated consistently. The north side of Hillsborough adj to Cameron Park and the northeast part of the University Park on Oberlin are bordered primarily by 3-story buildings and neighborhoods westward on the north side of Hillsborough should be as well. 4) Overbuilding on height and mass creates a negative effect on neighborhoods adjoining Hillsborough by creating traffic and overflow parking issues, making neighborhood streets less safe for families and their children. 5) Varying heights, building types and styles will make Hillsborough Street more appealing. As an already relatively narrow space, lining the street with stacks of housing creates a canyon effect rather than a welcoming destination. 6) Hillsborough Street should be able to accommodate both the student population as well as older and longer-term residents. Finding a balance to keep one culture from dominating another should be a major objective and consideration for future development. By keeping the 3-story zoning height entitlements approved under the UDO in areas adjacent to neighborhoods, a wider variety of development and accommodations serving a broader diversity of residents is more likely to occur. 7) Given the traffic congestion that already exists in the Small Area Plan and the recent focus for fast bus service on Western Blvd, not Hillsborough Street, higher density development is more appropriate on the south side, not the north, of Hillsborough.</p>	6 - Zone for the Future, 7 - Promote Quality Design

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter EE	<p>I live in an older neighborhood within walking distance of Hillsborough St. The current zoning for building heights not to exceed 3 stories outlined in the UDO for development adjacent to established neighborhoods should be kept in place along the north side of Hillsborough St. I am most concerned about the large parcel between Furches and Montgomery Streets and think that block should most certainly not exceed the three story entitlement.</p> <p>Given the small lots on the adjacent blocks east of Furches Street allowing taller buildings will generate more traffic and have a negative impact on my neighborhood. Keep the 3-story zoning entitlement along the entire north side of Hillsborough Street to preserve the vibrant neighborhoods of University Park.</p> <p>Overbuilding the height and mass of buildings close to well established neighborhoods has a negative effect with light, views, vehicle traffic and storm water run-off and other ecological issues.</p> <p>The current new buildings along Hillsborough St and at the corner of Oberlin and Clark have begin to create a canyon like feel. Hillsborough St is a narrow street and the current development occurring is very unappealing.</p> <p>The lack of diversity in the big new buildings is not contributing to an attractive urban area. The loss of sky view and trees feels like a canyon. To continue this pattern does NOT enhance the street or the livability of the older neighborhoods adjacent to Hillsborough Street.</p> <p>Zoning to keep varying heights, building types and styles can help maintain the charm of this major street and the neighborhoods. Keeping the 3 story zoning height entitlements approved under the UDO in areas adjacent to neighborhoods can help provide services to a more diverse population than simply the NCSU student population.</p> <p>In the 25 years we have lived in University Park we have seen rapid changes in the environmental impact of our growing city and area. The cut-through traffic flowing through our narrow streets along with more on street parking by students who share small homes initially built for a family have made our neighborhood feel more crowded and less safe.</p> <p>You will receive lots of comments about traffic but there are serious issues about the City’s inability to maintain the storm water streams and culverts. Flooding in small area parks due to a much higher volume of storm water run-off is common. The City of Raleigh is unwilling or unable to monitor the erosion occurring at building sites and the massive amount of soil run off is evident in the rising depth of storm water streams. I see the water rushing in storm water streams is red clay water. Silt retention fences are non-functional if used at all. Debris dams in the streams are also contributing to the rapid increase of erosion.</p> <p>Our older trees are suffering from the lack of protection when construction is underway. Drive way cuts and new construction that fall within the tree’s drip line are common. The orange fencing is closer to the tree’s trunk than aligning with the tree’s drip line. More paved surfaces, the lack of pervious soil to absorb water and fewer healthy trees with complex root networks which absorb rain water is NOT wise development. I am disturbed that these environmental issues are not being given enough serious consideration by city planners, appropriate city departments and neighborhood advocates. Given the rapid changes in our climate and the rapid loss of Raleigh’s once impressive green tree canopy is a grievous oversight. While there is much conversation about the infrastructure for traffic patterns the infrastructure of our city as we grow in order to have a HEALTHY city for the green world and other native life forms is not being given due consideration. The health of people is absolutely directly related to the health of the environment on all levels. This aspect of the conversation needs serious attention.</p>	6 - Zone for the Future, 7 - Promote Quality Design

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter GG	<p>Please see my comments below regarding the Planning Commission's considering an "automatic up zoning" of certain properties. My comments are particularly aimed at the property between Furches and Montgomery on Hillsborough, which lies one and a half blocks from our home. As you are aware, our neighborhood has been involved, enthusiastically, with potential developers of this site to achieve a win/win development for both the developer and the neighborhood. We love living in a more urban area of Raleigh and are not against development. We simply want a development that fits in with our neighborhood and does not detract from our neighborhood's well established character and quality of life. 1) Given the Comprehensive Plan's goal to preserve and enhance neighborhoods and the no more than 3-story zoning height currently outlined in Raleigh's UDO for development adjacent to established neighborhoods, the property between Furches and Montgomery should retain its 3-story entitlement. 2) Instead of automatic "up-zoning," any 3-sotry entitlement zoning currently in place should be considered for change only through a rezoning process based on details of individual project and conditions at time of development. 3) Borders of stable neighborhoods in the Small Area Plan should be treated consistently. The north side of Hillsborough adj to Cameron Park and the northeast part of the University Park on Oberlin are bordered primarily by 3-story buildings and neighborhoods westward on the north side of Hillsborough should be as well. 4) Overbuilding on height and mass creates a negative effect on neighborhoods adjoining Hillsborough by creating traffic and overflow parking issues, making neighborhood streets less safe for families and their children. 5) Varying heights, building types and styles will make Hillsborough Street more appealing. As an already relatively narrow space, lining the street with stacks of housing creates a canyon effect rather than a welcoming destination. 6) Hillsborough Street should be able to accommodate both the student population as well as older and longer-term residents. Finding a balance to keep one culture from dominating another should be a major objective and consideration for future development. By keeping the 3-story zoning height entitlements approved under the UDO in areas adjacent to neighborhoods, a wider variety of development and accommodations serving a broader diversity of residents is more likely to occur. 7) Given the traffic congestion that already exists in the Small Area Plan and the recent focus for fast bus service on Western Blvd, not Hillsborough Street, higher density development is more appropriate on the south side, not the north, of Hillsborough.</p>	6 - Zone for the Future, 7 - Promote Quality Design
Commenter RR	<p>I am concerned with the future development plans for the property between Furches and Montgomery for the following reasons: · Given the Comprehensive Plan’s goal to preserve and enhance neighborhoods and the no more than 3-story zoning height currently outlined in Raleigh’s Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) for development adjacent to established neighborhoods, the property between Furches and Montgomery should retain its 3-story entitlement. Instead of ‘up zoning’ to 4 stories, any 3-story entitlement zoning currently in place should be considered for change only through a rezoning process based on details of individual projects and conditions at time of development. Borders of stable neighborhoods in the Small Area Plan should be treated consistently. The north side of Hillsborough adjacent to Cameron Park and the northeast part of University Park on Oberlin are bordered primarily by 3- story buildings and neighborhoods westward on the north side of Hillsborough Street should be as well. Overbuilding on height and mass creates a negative affect for neighborhoods adjoining Hillsborough by creating traffic and overflow parking issues, making neighborhood streets less safe for neighbors and their children. Varying heights, building types, and styles will make Hillsborough Street more appealing. As an already relatively narrow space, lining the street with stacks of housing creates a canyon effect rather than a welcoming destination. Hillsborough Street should be able to accommodate both the student population as well as older and longer-term residents. Finding a balance to keep one culture from dominating another should be a major objective and consideration for future development. By keeping the 3- story zoning height entitlements approved under the UDO in areas adjacent to neighborhoods, a wider variety of development and accommodations serving a broader diversity of residents is more likely to occur. Given the traffic congestion that already exists in the Small Area Plan and the recent focus for fast bus service on Western Boulevard, not Hillsborough Street, higher density development is more appropriate on the south side, not the north, of Hillsborough. I truly hope that these concerns, shared by most in our University Park neighborhood, are taken into very serious consideration. Thank you for your support and understanding.</p>	6 - Zone for the Future, 7 - Promote Quality Design

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter SS	In the Cameron Village-Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan, 3-story designations are indicated on the north side of Hillsborough Street adjacent to Cameron Park and the northeast section of University Park on Oberlin. Other stable,vibrant neighborhoods in our urban area should be treated the same way. Given the goal of the Comprehensive Plan to preserve and enhance neighborhoods and UDO recommendations for no more than 3-stories adjacent to them, the 3-story entitlement designation now in place westward on the north side of Hillsborough is appropriate, both for consistency and for less traffic and overflow parking on narrow neighborhood streets. The OX-3 entitlement zoning recently applied to property between Furches and Montgomery Streets and others on the north side from Rosemary to Faircloth should be retained instead of up-zoning to 4-stories. Rezoning requests should be implemented based on details of an individual project and actual conditions at time of development, not as a blanket decision for all urban properties. By keeping 3-story height entitlements adjacent to residential neighborhoods, a wider variety of development and accommodations is more likely to occur and better serve a diversity of residents. Varying heights, building types, styles and uses along Hillsborough will appeal to a broader demographic than students and make the street the destination for our entire community as envisioned in the Hillsborough Street Vision Plan. There are many good features in the Small Area Plan such as new sidewalks, better greenway connections, park improvements, and more clearly defined bike lanes. Thanks for the time and effort on this plan and for giving the community the opportunity to be part of the growth process and discussion. Thoughtful development that will also retain Raleigh's character, charm, and special appeal is our mutual goal.	6 - Zone for the Future, 7 - Promote Quality Design
Commenter W	Overbuilding on height and mass creates a negative affect for neighborhoods adjoining Hillsborough by creating traffic and overflow parking issues, making neighborhood streets less safe for neighbors and their children. Varying heights, building types, and styles will make Hillsborough Street more appealing. As an already relatively narrow space, lining the street with stacks of housing creates a canyon effect rather than a welcoming destination. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.	6 - Zone for the Future, 7 - Promote Qualtiy Design
Commenter KK	Given the Comprehensive Plan’s goal to preserve and enhance neighborhoods and the no more than 3-story zoning height currently outlined in Raleigh’s Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) for development adjacent to established neighborhoods, the property between Furches and Montgomery should retain its 3-story entitlement. Instead of ‘up zoning’ to 4 stories, any 3-story entitlement zoning currently in place should be considered for change only through a rezoning process based on details of individual projects and conditions at time of development. Borders of stable neighborhoods in the Small Area Plan should be treated consistently. The north side of Hillsborough adjacent to Cameron Park and the northeast part of University Park on Oberlin are bordered primarily by 3- story buildings and neighborhoods westward on the north side of Hillsborough Street should be as well. Overbuilding on height and mass creates a negative affect for neighborhoods adjoining Hillsborough by creating traffic and overflow parking issues, making neighborhood streets less safe for neighbors and their children. Varying heights, building types, and styles will make Hillsborough Street more appealing. As an already relatively narrow space, lining the street with stacks of housing creates a canyon effect rather than a welcoming destination. Hillsborough Street should be able to accommodate both the student population as well as older and longer-term residents. Finding a balance to keep one culture from dominating another should be a major objective and consideration for future development. By keeping the 3- story zoning height entitlements approved under the UDO in areas adjacent to neighborhoods, a wider variety of development and accommodations serving a broader diversity of residents is more likely to occur. Given the traffic congestion that already exists in the Small Area Plan and the recent focus for fast bus service on Western Boulevard, not Hillsborough Street, higher density development is more appropriate on the south side, not the north, of Hillsborough.	6 - Zone for the Future, 7 - Promote Qualtiy Design
Commenter D	It was good to see you Saturday morning. Thanks for coming over from Durham to review The Cameron Village/Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan. It was helpful for us to ask questions and get your insights on the plan and the public comment process. I was pleased to fine out you had worked in Baltimore and were familiar with the city's Urban Design Architecture Review Panel. With the way Raleigh is growing, new buildings going up all over, it seems a design and architecture review would be an important part of the Planning Department's site plan review process. Do you think creating a review panel is a possibility?	7 - Promote Quality Design
Commenter K	We are writing with regards to the proposed zoning revision from OX-3 to OX-5 in the northern tip of District 1, of the subject. The Project Status site notes the “draft report...is available for public comment through May 8, 2016.” Specifically, we are quite concerned about the likely worsening of already insufficient sight and sound buffers at the western end of Diehl and Williamson Streets, adjacent to proposed changes. There is a balance to be had that will provide improvements for all affected by the plan, and we expect and appreciate your consideration of our concerns as the plans move forward. And we look forward to meeting you as things progress.	7 - Promote Quality Design
Commenter MM	Is it possible to get a paper copy of this report? (I’m an active member of Pullen Church, at 1801 Hillsborough and know our church is in a dynamic place!)	

Cameron Village and Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan Public Responses to Draft Report		
Name	Comment	Planning Strategy
Commenter NN	I just looked at the Small Area Plan and it looks like my property is being reclassified as residential when it is a historic home that is used as an office (and has been for almost 20 years.) Am I interpreting this correctly? Thank you!	
Raleigh Historic Development Commission	Maiden Lane National Register District - any public support for local designation and protection? Any exploration of incentives or other tools to encourage preservation of existing buildings on Hillsborough Street? What is the best way to provide formal comments from RHDC?	



University Park

Homeowners Association

UPHA Board of Directors

Recommended Enhancements to the Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan

May 8, 2016



University Park Vanderbilt Avenue Homes

University Park is a vibrant urban neighborhood noteworthy for its history and its diversity of population, housing stock and architectural styles. In the words of internationally recognized urban planner Dan Burden:
“Neighborhoods of the character and quality of University Park are rarely built today.”



University Park

Homeowners Association

PO Box 10343, Raleigh, NC 27605

Board of Directors 2016

President

Chris Herndon
400 Pogue St.

VP for Community Development

Bill Hube
19 Furches St.

VP for Communications

Randy Carter
3316 Clark Ave.

VP of Real Estate

Greg Flynn
2816 Barmettler St.

Secretary

Ari Sanoff
2200 Enterprise St.

Treasurer

David Novak
3417 Cherry Lane

At-Large Directors

Bailey Tucker
203 Furches St.

Bill Hamilton
2830 Barmettler Ave.

Danny Taylor
2807 Fowler St.

Past President

Sallie Ricks
2715 Rosedale Ave.

May 5, 2016

Re: University Park Homeowners Association Review of the Hillsborough St
Small Area Plan

Dear Ms. Ekstrom,

On behalf of our neighborhood, the University Park Homeowners Association and its Board I would like to give a very special thank you to Bynum Walter and Ken Bowers for their dedication to study and incorporate the public's input for the SAP Draft Report. Public participation ensures the plan reflects the values and needs of residents to protect the lovely, vibrant neighborhoods surrounding the study areas.

The UPHA Board appreciates the continued opportunity to review and provide important input for the SAP draft report. The UPHA Board offers the following feedback which we believe enhances neighborhoods and provides for long term sustainability as we grow density and diversity of residents and business opportunities:

1. State clearly in the SAP report that the current UDO zoning districts remain the underlying base zoning throughout the SAP study area.

The SAP is contradictory regarding the discussion of "Zone for the Future". In some places the zoning discussion is called "guidance" or "recommendations". In other places the report says "Modify zoning in the study area to achieve desired plan outcomes. . . see figure 10 & 11. . ." The report needs to clearly and consistently state that changes to the current UDO zoning districts must be privately initiated. For clarity to property owners, potential developers, and residents, please correct the report to provide consistent terminology and remove ambiguity regarding rezoning at every discussion of zoning districts in the report.

We believe that insufficient proper legal public notice was given at the outset of the public process to even consider a City initiated up-zoning for any parcel(s). Furthermore, additional entitlements should be granted only when property owners demonstrate a public benefit to justify additional entitlement for their property as well as proper consideration given to the property rights of affected property owners.

No explanation of the differences between city initiated re-zoning versus privately initiated zoning was offered in the SAP. In our opinion, there was an overreach in the final public survey for questions related to City initiated up-zoning without a thorough discussion of possible outcome differences between by-right entitlement and condition use rezoning.

To be clear, we ***do not support City initiated up-zoning*** of areas the report contemplates for increased height or zoning entitlement.

2. Indicate in the report that the rezoning process is the only legally binding tool currently available to citizens to achieve site specific project design that addresses particular context and area concerns of the surrounding community.

The report needs to state that any standards above the UDO requirements can be achieved only through the public rezoning process. Many renderings in the report depict design and construction alternatives that exceed UDO minimum standards that could only be required and guaranteed through a public rezoning process. Areas of neighborhood concern that are often vetted in the rezoning process include:

- quality, contextual materials and design,
- percentage of public open space,
- parking plans,
- control of overflow traffic,
- public pedestrian amenities, benches, crosswalks, etc.
- affordable housing,
- housing unit type,
- traffic calming,
- street front activity and business types

The rezoning process is integral to achieving high quality new development that adds benefit to the surrounding community in exchange for additional entitlement above the current zoning.

3. The SAP needs to be consistent in applying a 3-story height maximum where commercial and mixed-use areas abut all low and moderate density residential properties and neighborhoods.

The report states "Ensure height transitions between residential and commercial." The draft report is not consistent in defining and applying the UDO transitions. There are strong feelings among neighbors within the study area that the transitions should apply equally to all residential properties in the study area. Please apply the 3-story maximum height transitions to all residential areas in the study area including but not limited to: the north side of Hillsborough Street, the west side of Oberlin Rd and the south side of Clark Ave.

4. The SAP report for Hillsborough Street states a desire to “preserve and add to diversity in all its forms.” The draft report needs to offer strategies to build diverse housing types to avoid a monoculture community of student housing along Hillsborough St.

Hillsborough Street area neighbors have become increasingly concerned at the growing monoculture of student housing through this corridor. Student markets are limiting. The SAP draft report does not bring forward strategies to promote greater diversity of housing types attractive to non-student residents that will encourage a wider range of area businesses and employment opportunities.

5. Retain R-6 zoning for Vanderbilt Ave to prevent both physical and visual encroachment from Hillsborough Street redevelopment. We support further public study of this area.

The residential street identified in the plan for further study, Vanderbilt Avenue, is an integral part of the West Raleigh Historic District and home of the earliest structures associated with the formation of NC State University and the University Park neighborhood. The proposed public engagement and study to explore new uses and conditions of the Vanderbilt Ave homes must be framed to offer the protections of the current R-6 zoning and preserve the architecture, character, and history of this important street.

6. Please add the West Raleigh National Register Historic District Nomination to the list of “Relevant Studies” found in the report.

7. Based on prior survey of our University Park neighborhood residents, pedestrian improvements leading to a more walkable neighborhood are a very high priority.

Thank you for including our recommended modifications to enhance the Cameron Village/ Hillsborough Street Small Area Plan to ensure the report reflects the values and needs of all residents and to promote the sustainability of the city’s historic and vibrant neighborhoods surrounding the study areas.

Sincerely,

Chris Herndon
President University Park Homeowner Association

cc: Raleigh City Councilors
UPHA Board of Directors

